

June 4, 2011

Rosemary Chiavetta, Secretary
Pennsylvania Public Utilities Commission
Commonwealth Keystone Building
400 North Street, 2nd Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17120

RECEIVED

JUN 04 2011

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

RE: **Rosalyn B. Gilchrist v. PECO Energy Company**
Docket No. F-2011-2238078

Dear Secretary Chiavetta:

Enclosed you will find my written response to PECO Energy Company's (PECO) Answer and New Matter in the above referenced matter. My response to PECO's Answer and New Matter has been addressed to the best of my ability and it is being sent VIA FEDEX.

PECO's counsel and PECO representative are listed together. Therefore I will be forwarding copies to the lawyers at Steven & Lee and Tishkia Williams at PECO. Their copies will be sent via certified mail with return receipts requested.

STEVENS & LEE
Dana Pirone Carosella, Esquire
Michael A. Gruin, Esquire
Attorney I.D. Nos. 57221; 78625
1818 Market Street, 29th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Tishkia Williams
PECO Energy Company
2301 Market Street, S23-1
PO Box 8699
Philadelphia, PA 19101-8699

Respectfully,



Rosalyn B. Gilchrist
Docket No. F-2011-2238078

Enclosures: **Written Response to PECO's Answers and New Matter for Docket F-2011-2238078**
Documents (3) to support my response to PECO's answer and new matter to show
1) Heater insulation date, 2) Year heater was installed, 3) Copy of completed Medical
Certification submitted to PECO in 2008 (Stating the illness is Permanent)

RECEIVED

JUN 04 2011

RESPONSE TO PECO's ANSWER AND NEW MATTER

Preface:

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

My decision to submit a formal complaint was reached after reviewing the reasons for dismissal listed under the heading "**Investigation by Staff of the Public Utility Commission Found**" in the **Informal Complaint Decision letter from The Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (PUC)**. **This letter is dated March 12, 2011 with the BCS #2793906.**

The findings noted under the heading in this letter are listed numerically. Seven out of the eight findings listed begin with the phrase "**According to PECO's records.**" These findings were either totally or partially inaccurate. Therefore, I was impelled to respond by submitting a formal complaint. I followed the same numbering system in PUC's decision letter, referred to as **EXHIBIT B**, to address the inaccuracies. Failure to respond would have been admitting that those findings were true and accurate.

Again, I am impelled to make a response. In this case, I must respond to PECO's written "**ANSWER**" to the items listed in my formal complaint. The **NOTICE TO PLEAD**, statement, "If you do not file a written response denying or correcting the enclosed New Matter within (20) days of service, the facts set forth by PECO may be deemed to be true, . . . and judgement may be entered against you." Therefore, I will push aside my inclination to "let it go." Failure to respond would mean my complaints, along with the documentation to support my complaints were not true.

I have felt from the start that PECO, a huge corporation, would "come out on top" against any complaint made by a low-income person unable to afford a lawyer. Aside from that, it was never my desire or intent to *get anything from them*. True, I had received a shut-off notice in November 2010. However, I made several attempts to make payment arrangements and made several requests to obtain a Medical Certification form. The response to my requests was I was "not eligible for LIHEAP or the CAP program." That was not my request. I was trying to make *arrangements* to pay my own bill. I also wanted a satisfactory answer to my question about the enormous increase in kWh usage. (*See my letter dated 2/6/2011, submitted with my formal complaint.*) My attempts were unsuccessful and I sought PUC's help.

I noted the statement on the back of PECO's 10-day shut-off notice, "**After you talk with us, if you are not satisfied, you may file a complaint with the Public Utility Commission (PUC).**" Also, I noted the **table showing Monthly Income at 250% of Federal Poverty Level**. The bulleted-provision stated if my income was below the poverty guideline for my household size, PECO must first ask PUC for permission to shut off my service. The provisions also stated "If that number is the same or less than the amount listed in chart below for your household size, call us immediately at 1-888-480-1533. You will be required to provide us with proof of your income." I had already attempted to make arrangements and made several requests for the Medical Certification Form.. If PECO did not know my income level, how was it possible to determine I was not eligible for LIHEAP or CAP. My monthly income is under \$2256, the poverty guideline for my household size.

I have never stated or implied that I was seeking any compensation from PECO or any other action to be taken *against* PECO. My motive is clearly stated in my letter regarding BCS 2770872, dated

RESPONSE TO PECO's ANSWER AND NEW MATTER

2/6/11, the last two sentences. "I want to pay *my* bill, what *I* owe. Please *help me* find the truth."

Therefore, for the sake of truth, I am responding to the items numerically listed in PECO's written "ANSWER" with the understanding that the numerical list is the same one used in the Informal Complaint Decision letter I received from PUC dated 3/12/2011, with the reference BCS 2793906 *and* which is the same numerical listing used in my formal complaint.

RESPONSE TO PECO'S ANSWERS:

My response to PECO's ANSWERS are formatted as follows:

- The number matching PECO's ANSWER that I am responding to, (If #1-3 of PECO's answers are referring to #1-3 of the Formal Complaint sections, no response is needed. If #1-3 refer to the numbering used in the 3/12/2011 PUC Decision Letter, the comments listed below stand.)
- Below PECO's ANSWER, PUC's finding "according to PECO's records." These findings are listed because my formal complaint was made based on the findings that were incorrect and not "with prejudice." If the decision to dismiss my informal complaint was based on findings that were true, there would have been no need for me to file a formal complaint.
- My response to deny or correct **New Matter**.

1. Admitted

PUC FINDING: According to PECO's records, on January 3, 2011, a bill was issued in the amount of \$622.58. This included past due charges of \$460.44 and current charges of \$162.14.

My Response This finding does not show that in my complaint I referenced this bill to focus on the due date.

Therefore, Admitted, means PECO admits that the \$162.14 was not due until 2/3/2011. (This is the date on the paper copy of my bill and the 4/1/2011 printout of PECO's "VIEW BILL ONLINE:)

2. Admitted

PUC FINDING: According to BCS's records, on January 4, 2011, payment arrangement #2770782 was established for the budget of \$97.00 plus \$21.93 beginning with the February due date. The account balance was \$622.58. The customer paid \$162.14 on January 14.

My Response I was not aware of the payment arrangement established by PUC with PECO until I received the letter dated 1/14/2011.

RESPONSE TO PECO's ANSWER AND NEW MATTER

PUC established the arrangement with PECO, according to BCS' records #2770782, January 4, 2011. However, it to not come to my knowledge until it was listed among the findings which led to dismissing the informal complaint.

I had been informed by the PUC representative, prior to the arrangement day of 1/4/2011, that I must pay my current bills on time. There was no need to contact them, I hear from them (PUC) if/when arrangements were made. As I stated in #1, the due date on the bill was 2/3/2011. (As shown on the paper copy of my bill and the 4/1/2011 printout of PECO's "View Bill Online."

I did not pay \$162.14 on January 14. I paid \$163.00 on 1/31/2011, using a credit card. This payment was not an acceptance of *any* payment arrangement with PECO. In the call on 1/31/2011, I was told I was in default and to reinstate the arrangement I must pay the \$162.14 at that time. If I did not make the payment that day, I would have to pay the full balance of \$622.58. I had not heard from PUC at the time, but my bill issued on 1/3/2011 was due on 2/3/2011. So in order not to damage any arrangements made by PUC, I paid the current bill on 1/31/2011. My formal complaint refers to my 2/6/2011 letter for other details, as well as documentation regarding this finding.

Therefore, Admitted, means PECO admits the amount and date paid stated in #2 of PUC's findings is not accurate. Therefore, **EXHIBIT B**, showing the issue date of the dismissal and the decision is based on incorrect information.

3. Admitted

PUC FINDING: According to PECO's records, on January 31, 2011, the **payment agreement was reinstated** on a balance of \$459.58.

My Response **There was NO PAYMENT AGREEMENT between PECO and me until the one established by PUC on 1/4/2011. I received notification of this agreement from PUC in a letter dated 1/14/2011. (EXHIBIT A)**

However, prior to receiving PUC's **decision** dated 1/14/2011 and the budget arrangements, I received a "**Payment Agreement Confirmation**" from PECO, also dated 1/14/2011, stating "As you requested, your account has been placed on a deferred payment plan for the amount of \$622.58." The letter stated I must pay \$162.14 as a deposit. *(To verify this statement and other details relating to this agreement, see the 1/14/2011 PECO letter, which was submitted with my formal complaint)*

RESPONSE TO PECO's ANSWER AND NEW MATTER

I NEVER MADE THIS ARRANGEMENT. Also, I never sent the **down payment** of \$162.14 as requested **immediately** because it appeared I would be indicating acceptance of the arrangement. Before contacting PUC, my requests for arrangements were denied.

EXHIBIT B, which reflects the 3/12/2011 decision, fails to show in the #2 under "**Based on These Findings We Conclude That**" which appears in my copy of the Informal Complaint Decision Letter dated 3/12/2011. Number One states, "Bills are correct as rendered and are based on actual meter readings.." Number two states, "The customer is current on the payment arrangement with \$141.88." **EXHIBIT B** shows \$120.00 as the Regular Budget Amount, but does not show the "Plus Arrears Payment." The date of **EXHIBIT B** is 5/16/2011.

Therefore, **Admitted** in my opinion, means PECO admits there was **no reinstatement because there had been no payment agreement prior to the one established by PUC with PECO on 1/4/2011 and revealed to me in the 1/14/2011 decision letter. (EXHIBIT A)**

4. Admitted in part; Denied in part

PUC FINDING: According to PECO's records, on **February 2, 2011**, a bill was issued in the amount of **\$710.48**. This included **past due charges of \$459.58 and \$250.90** for 2320 kWh based on an actual meter reading of 73419. The amount due was the budget of \$97.00. This was paid on March 1.

My Response In my formal complaint, I **did not state there were "changes"** on my bill. There were changes on my Billing and Payment History. (The printouts for 4/1/2011 and 4/11/2011 were submitted with the formal complaint.)

PUC Finding #4, states PECO records show a bill was issued **2/2/2011** in the amount of \$710.48. **The actual billing date is 2/1/2011**. PECO's **ANSWER** to # 4 states this same billing date, and the Billing and History printed on 4/1/2011 and 4/11/2011 lists this date also.

The bill was not issued in the amount of **\$710.48**. **The amount of \$710.48 was not on the paper copy of my bill**. The bill had only the budget amount of \$97.00 and the "Message Center" notice informing me that after review "**this month**" the budget amount was changed to \$120.00 effective the next bill." (This bill was also submitted with my formal complaint.) **The January 3, 2011 bill was the last bill showing the balance on the past due amount. The May 31, 2011 bill still does not show the balance on the past due bill.**

RESPONSE TO PECO's ANSWER AND NEW MATTER

On 1/31/2011, I received an automated call stating I was in default and the amount of \$162.14 must be paid to reinstate the arrangement (*which I never made*) or pay the full balance of \$622.58. With the next day being February 1, and the budget arrangement to begin with the next "due date" (EXHIBIT A) which was February 3, 2011, I felt I had to pay in order for the budget arrangement to remain in effect. **The timing and wording of this call made me feel pressured to pay. Thus, I would express my feelings as being "forced to pay."**

Thinking it would be easier to go online to access and print my bills, I went to PECO's Billing & Payment History on 4/1/2011. My purpose in going to the site was to see the listing of usage and average temperatures for the 2-year period. I noted the payment column showed no payments from 4/2009 through 3/31/2011. I was not able to print out bills, even with an updated version of Acrobat Reader. On 4/11/2011, I went online again to try and print the bills. I was still unsuccessful, but it was then that I noticed the difference in the listings. Now the Payment column did show amounts, but **in addition there were entries on 1/14/2011 "Payment Agreement," 1/28/2011 "Reinstate AR from DPA-Cr," and on 1/31/2011 two entries "Payment Agreement" 459.58 and "Payment" \$163.00.**

This conflicts with PUC's finding #2, which states "The customer paid \$162.14 on January 14. **What is AR from DPA-Cr?** I did not have an agreement with PECO until the budget plan established by PUC to be effective February 2011 due date, which was 2/3/2011.

PECO states "Based upon the information supplied with the Complaint, PECO can neither admit nor deny the factual allegations in this paragraph concerning any medical condition..." I admit that no medical certification form was submitted with the formal complaint, but also admit that a Medical certification from **Julia Elcock-Vengen, MD**, (*See enclosed copy of the completed form and envelop*) Dr. Elcock-Vengen is located at the Philadelphia Health Care Center #3, 555 S. 43rd Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104. On the form she stated the permanency of my illness, machines required for each illness, and what would happen if electricity were shut off. In addition, PECO should have a Medical Certification from **Dr. Doghramji**, 211 S. 9th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19107.

PECO, states it can not admit or deny the *reason* I contacted PUC or the nature of the communication. PECO does admit that on 11/22/2010, an informal complaint was filed with the Bureau of Consumer Services. (BCS 2770782) Prior to contacting PUC, attempts were made to make payment arrangements and multiple requests for a Medical Certification form. In

RESPONSE TO PECO's ANSWER AND NEW MATTER

addition, on the back of the 10-day shut-off notice there is information regarding when to contact PUC and the poverty level guidelines requiring PUC permission to shut-off service.

If PECO cannot admit or deny the reason I contacted PUC or the nature of the communication, it cannot make the accusation "Complainant filed this complaint as a way to avoid termination for an unpaid balance owed to PECO." This statement implies that I was trying to get out of paying my bill and suggests that my stating that I wanted to make payment arrangements to pay *my bill* is not true. If it were determined, and it has since been determined, that what was billed is what I owe, then so be it. Still, I needed payment arrangements..

Again, there is confusion regarding billing. PECO's **ANSWER** under #4 states, "installment payments of \$22 on the unpaid balance of \$519.32, together with her then budget bill payment of \$97.00." There is no mention of PECO's change in the budget bill amount to \$120.00.

PECO's **ANSWER** continues by stating, "BCS properly determined that the Complainant is required to pay her current bills before the payment agreement would start in February 2011." **EXHIBIT A** confirms the BCS **PAR Description** states, "BY LAW YOU MUST PAY ANY CURRENT BILLS DUE BEFORE THIS PAYMENT ARRANGEMENT STARTS." The **Resolution Description** states: "BB 92)22+119... LEVEL 2 BEGINNING FEBRUARY 2011 DUE DATE," The 1/3/2011 bill shows the February due date as 2/3/2011.

PECO's **ANSWER**, "On February 17, 2011, the Complainant initiated another complaint with the BCS at case number 002793906, for the purpose of disputing her February 1, 2011 bill. Again, if PECO cannot admit or deny my reason for initially contacting PUC or the nature of the conversation, how can PECO state with certainty what my *purpose* for initiating "another" complaint with the BCS 002793906. Referring to my informal complaints and formal complaint, it should be noted that I have stated, 'I just want to pay my own bill, to make payment arrangements to pay my bill, myself, and to know what is *true*. Knowing what is true would involve correcting any inaccuracies, having my questions answered or explained in a clear and understandable manner, to be able to go online or read my paper bill and know the exact amount I owe, and in my case, know what my balance is on my past due charges.

According to PECO's records, bills were sent out for \$710.48 on 2/2/2011 and \$792.63 on 3/2/2011. Paper copies of my bills show this information is not

RESPONSE TO PECO's ANSWER AND NEW MATTER

correct. (*Copies of these bills were submitted with my formal complaint.*) Also, PECO's online Billing and Payment History does not show these billing amounts. "According to PECO's records," BCS's used this finding as one of the reasons for the decision to dismiss my complaint (**EXHIBIT B**).

PUC FINDING: According to PECO's records, on March 3, 2011, the customer was advised that the increase was due to the colder temperatures. The customer said she had problems with the heating unit and had this replaced. The customer said she thought there might be foreign wiring.

My Response: The reason I asked about the possibility of foreign wiring was to get a satisfactory answer for the unusual increase in usage. On or about 4/6 - 4/10/2010, a \$900.00 Final Shut-off Bill that was stuck under my door. The bill was for a Joan Kierkegaard, 801 Locust Street, #221, account 03489-25011. I contacted PECO immediately after opening the envelop in error. I contacted them to let them know the notice had not been delivered to the intended recipient.

On another occasion around the same time period, a PECO representative was in the lobby of our building on the phone. His voice raised, he stated, "We cut it off and someone turned it back on and it wasn't a PECO rep." (*See my letter dated 2/6/2011 under the heading, "Other Pertinent Reasons for Questioning Charges."*)

A new heater was installed in (2009) (*See attached form dated 4/20/2009.*) **If the hard-wired heater was installed in 2009 and it is believed this is the reason for the increase in usage, then my bills should have reflected that in 2009.**

My reason for concern and seeking a more satisfying explanation is because during the four years that I have lived here, I have not had a bill that shows that much usage. This has been despite the fact that I have used the oven and stove top as a way to stay warm. This year I decided to close off the bath and bedroom and stay in one room. I weatherized everything and made fleece clothing to wear around the apartment and to bed. My friends, family, and attendants were aware of the cold (*ranging from 42-56 degrees in the bedroom and bath*)

It was not until 12/23/2010 that insulation was put around the heater. No new heater was put in my presence or work order left that my heater was replaced. Therefore, with the insulation installed, my usage should have been less not higher.

RESPONSE TO PECO's ANSWER AND NEW MATTER

Below is the data PUC obtained for the months of December 2009 and 2010 and January 2010 and 2011. This data was among the findings listed and used as one of the reasons for dismissing my complaint..

123009	1259	kWh	38	Avg Temp
123110	1451	kWh	34	Avg Temp
013110	1540	kWh	33	Avg Temp
013111	2320	kWh	30	Avg Temp

A three degree difference in Avg Temperature is noted when comparing 1/2010 and 1/2011. I cannot understand how this could cause such a drastic increase in usage (780 mor kWh) when a similar comparison for the period 12/2009 and 12/31/10 , showing a four degree difference in Avg Temperature, had only little less than 200 kWh more usage. .

5. Paragraph 5 is a Request for Relief and no answer is required. PECO incorporates by reference its answer to the allegations in paragraph 4.

My Response: The explanations and documentation in my informal and formal complaints, as well as the response to PECO's ANSWERS represent issues I have supported with documentation or they were feelings I expressed. The explanations supported by documentation.... enough said. The feelings that I express are just that, feelings. Where there was no supporting documentation I have noted that those statements were my "feelings" or "opinion." Therefore, giving me a *satisfying* explanation to show why my feelings and opinions are not valid would be sufficient.

8. PECO incorporates by reference its responses contained in Paragraphs 1 through 7 above as though fully set forth at length.

PUC FINDINGS: As mention, PUC's lists 8 findings that influenced their decision to dismiss the complaint. My response to the **New Matter** submitted (Exhibit A and Exhibit B) is included in the previous paragraphs. My formal complaint also addressed these Exhibits in detail and with supporting documents.

Therefore, in my opinion, EXHIBIT A and B are not NEW MATTER. As seen in my responses above, these EXHIBITS have been addressed and documentation referring to them attached to my formal complaint. References to these decisions have been made because their content either supported my statements (EXHIBIT A) or contained statements of record by PECO that were not accurate. (EXHIBIT B)

RESPONSE TO PECO's ANSWER AND NEW MATTER

Thus, since I have responded in writing to PECO's ANSWERS and NEW MATTER, I feel I have met my obligation to file a written response denying or correcting any assumptions or inaccuracies.

I feel that any continuance on this matter is not a wise use of time and is unnecessary. As shown on the enclosed Medical Certification form sent to PECO in July 2008, my health is not good. This situation with PECO has exacerbated my condition. During a 3-month period beginning on 1/30/2011, I have had three emergency room visits, two of which were heart-related.

I know these statements regarding my health may appear irrelevant. However, as far as I am concerned, my reasons for complaint have been resolved. I now have payment arrangements allowing me to pay my bill and have uninterrupted service. I have been given the opportunity to address and respond to any untrue statements or implications. The issue of the 2,320 kWh may never be explained. So be it.

In addition to sending you this response via FEDEX, a copy of my response is being sent to:

STEVEN & LEE
Dana Pirone Carosella, Esquire
Michael A. Gruin, Esquire
Attorney I.D. Nos. 57221; 78625
1818 Market Street, 29th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Tishekia Williams
PECO Energy Company
2301 Market Street, S23-1
PO Box 8699
Philadelphia, PA 19101-8699

Respectfully,



Rosalyn B. Gilchrist
Docket No. F-2011-2238078

RECEIVED

JUN 04 2011

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

ROSALYN B. GILCHRIST V. PECO ENERGY
Docket No. F-2011-2238078 COMPANY

Dr. Slack-Vengen, m.
555 S. 43rd St. (HC#3)
Phila PA 19104

RECEIVED

JUN 04 2011

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Ms. Rosalyn Gilchrist
801 Locust St.
Apt. 220
Philadelphia PA 19107

1910785516 0095



Rosalyn B. Gilchrist
PECO ENERGY COMPANY
DOCKET NO. F-2011-2238078



0103-Page 2

PECO Energy Company
Medical Certification Verification Dept.
4725 BRIDGE VIEW DR
NORTH CHARLESTON, SC 29405

Account Number: 0034568146
June 13, 2008

RECEIVED

JUN 04 2011

1235 2 AT 0.471 1235001235001348 007 02 GX6RIE 5 06142008
ROSALYN GILCHRIST
APT 220
801 LOCUST ST
PHILADELPHIA PA 19107-5522
|||||

For Service to:
801 LOCUST ST PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
220
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19107
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Phone No: 1-888-480-1533
Fax No: 1-800-590-2799

Is your service off? Yes No

Part A (To Be Completed By Customer)

Name of person who is seriously ill: ROSALYN GILCHRIST
Relationship to the customer: SELF

Part B (To Be Completed By Doctor/Nurse Practitioner)

Name of person who is seriously ill: ROSALYN GILCHRIST Patient's DOB: 6/3/1950
Relationship to the customer: SELF
Patient's Address (if other than above): 801 LOCUST ST. APT 220
Nature of illness: Sarcoidosis, Sleep Apnea, D.D., Diabetes Mellitus - requires insulin & requires electricity for CPAP machine & electric wheelchair
Specific reason utility service is required to prevent aggravation of the illness: Extremes in humidity & temperature aggravate Respiratory Distress
How long do you expect the illness to last: permanent

Please Print Doctor/Nurse Practitioner Name
Julia Elcock Vengen, MD
Health Center #3
555 S. 43rd Street
Philadelphia, PA 19104
215-685-7500

MD062119-L
License Number

Office Address
Doctor/Nurse Practitioner Signature: [Signature]

Office Phone Number: 21508
Date Signed

This certificate is good for the expected length of the illness, up to a maximum of 30 days, unless you renew it.

It is your duty as a customer to arrange to make payments on all bills.



APWH
RECEIVED

JUN 04 2011

ROSALYN B. Gilchrist v. PECO ENERGY COMPANY
DOCKET No. F-20112238078

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

**ANNUAL
UNIT INSPECTION REPORT**

Project Name: American Postal Workers House

Date of Inspection: 5/20/09

Name of Family: COLEMAN/

Unit No.: 227

No. of Bedrooms: 1

No. of Baths: 1

KITCHEN	Acceptable		Repairs Needed (Comments)	Acceptable		Repairs Needed (Comments)
	Yes	No		Yes	No	
Ceiling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		HEATING EQUIPMENT		
Doors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		HVAC Unit	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Repair/Replace
Walls	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Thermostat	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Floors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Filter	<input type="checkbox"/>	Replace
Stove	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Hot Water Heater	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Refrigerator	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Drainboard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Sink	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Elec. Fixtures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Cabinets	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
BATHROOM			MISCELLANEOUS			
Doors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Screens	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Walls	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Shades	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Ceiling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Floor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Toilet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Flow Valve / Pipes			
Tub or Shower	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Elec. Fixtures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
LIVING ROOM & DINING AREA						
Doors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Walls	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Ceiling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Floor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Elec. Fixtures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Window	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
ALCOVE			HALLWAY			
Walls	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Closets	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Ceiling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Carpet	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Floor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Walls	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Elec. Fixtures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Floors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Closet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
BEDROOM NO. 1			OTHER			
Doors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Walls	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Ceiling	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Floor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Elec. Fixtures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
Window	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Family Certification

I certify that the foregoing report correctly represents the condition of the above-mentioned unit.

[Signature]
Signature of Family member who made this inspection

Owner's Certification

I certify that the foregoing report correctly represents the condition of the above identified unit. If this report discloses any deficiencies, I certify that they will be remedied within 30 days of the date of this inspection.

[Signature]
Signature of Owner/Agent

ROSALYN B. Gilchrist v. PECO ENERGY COMPANY
DOCKET NO. F-2011-2238078

American Postal Workers House
801 Locust street
Philadelphia, PA 19107

Work Order No. 313
Date Call 12/23/2010 10:03 am
Date Scheduled: 12/23/2010 10:03 am

Status Scheduled

Brief Desc: UNIT 220-SMOKE DETECTOR
Job Site: 801/0220
801 LOCUST STREET 0220,
801 LOCUST STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19107

Caller: ROSALYN GILCHRIST

Occupant: GILCHRIST (10000248)
(215) 910-6692

OK to enter? NO
Category: Maintenance

Technician Notes

Time: _____ Date: 12-23-10
Material: INSTALLED INSULATION AROUND HVAC UNIT AND RESET
SMOKE Det. O.K. (Rich will bring ather piece for HVAC
RICH / FRAW TOP

Problem Description: SMOKE DETECTOR KEEPS FLASHING, VENT IN BEDROOM BLOWING OUT COLD AIR.

Parts & Labor

Quantity	Stock Code/ Employee Name	Description	Unit Price	Total
		Commission		

TOTAL: _____

Authorized by: _____

Signed by: Rosalyn Gilchrist
Dated: 12-23-2010
Invoice No. _____

Full Description: SMOKE DETECTOR KEEPS FLASHING, VENT IN BEDROOM BLOWING OUT COLD AIR.

RECEIVED

JUN 04 2011

PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION
SECRETARY'S BUREAU

FedEx Tracking Number

8741 6249 9295

0200 Form ID No

FedEx Retrieval Copy

1 From
 Date 6-4-2011 Sender's FedEx Account Number
 Senr/ Nan ROSALYN B. GILCHRIST
 801 LOCUST STREET, 220
 Con PHILADELPHIA, PA 19107
 Add
 City State ZIP

1018 215 923 0687

RECEIVED

JUN 04 2011

2 Your Internal Billing Reference

3 To Recipient's Name ROSEMARY CHIAVETTA PA PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION SECRETARY'S BUREAU

Company PENNSYLVANIA Public Utilities Commission

Address Commonwealth Keystone Building 01 HOLD Weekday FedEx location address REQUIRED. NOT available for FedEx First Overnight.

Address 400 NORTH ST. 2ND FLOOR 31 HOLD Saturday FedEx location address REQUIRED. Available ONLY for FedEx Priority Overnight and FedEx 2Day in select locations.
HARRISBURG, PA 17120

City State ZIP

4a Express Package Service * To most locations. Packages up to 150 lbs.

01 FedEx Priority Overnight Next business morning. * Friday shipments will be delivered on Monday unless SATURDAY Delivery is selected.
 05 FedEx Standard Overnight Next business afternoon. * Saturday Delivery NOT available.
 06 FedEx First Overnight Earliest next business morning delivery to select locations.
 03 FedEx 2Day Second business day. * Thursday shipments will be delivered on Monday unless SATURDAY Delivery is selected.
 20 FedEx Express Saver Third business day. * Saturday Delivery NOT available.

4b Express Freight Service ** To most locations. Packages over 150 lbs.

70 FedEx 1Day Freight Next business day. ** Friday shipments will be delivered on Monday unless SATURDAY Delivery is selected. FedEx 1Day Freight Booking No.
 80 FedEx 2Day Freight Second business day. ** Thursday shipments will be delivered on Monday unless SATURDAY Delivery is selected.
 83 FedEx 3Day Freight Third business day. ** Saturday Delivery NOT available.

5 Packaging * Declared value limit \$500.

06 FedEx Envelope * 02 FedEx Pak* Includes FedEx Small Pak and FedEx Large Pak.
 03 FedEx Box 04 FedEx Tube 01 Other

6 Special Handling and Delivery Signature Options

03 SATURDAY DELIVERY

No Signature Required Package may be left without obtaining a signature for delivery.
 10 Direct Signature Someone at recipient's address may sign for delivery. Fee applies.
 34 Indirect Signature If no one is available at recipient's address, someone at a neighboring address may sign for delivery. For residential deliveries only. Fee applies.

Does this shipment contain dangerous goods?
 No 04 Yes One box must be checked.
 No 04 Yes Is per attached Shipper's Declaration. Yes Shipper's Declaration not required. 06 Dry Ice Dry Ice, 3, UN 1845 x y kg
 Dangerous goods (including dry ice) cannot be shipped in FedEx packaging or placed in a FedEx Express Drop Box. Cargo Aircraft Only

7 Payment Bill to:

1 Sender Acct. No. in Section 1 will be billed. 2 Recipient 3 Third Party 4 Credit Card 5 Cash/Check

Total Packages Total Weight
 Credit Card Auth. 2218

*Our liability is limited to \$100 unless you declare a higher value. See the current FedEx Service Guide for details.

fedex.com 1800.GoFedEx 1800.463.3339

fedex.com 1800.GoFedEx 1800.463.3339



8741 6249 9295

606